



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,612	12/30/2003	Phillip Ace McCoppin	201818-0307164	2890
909 7590 11/01/2010 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP P.O. BOX 10500 MCLEAN, VA 22102				
EXAMINER BAIRD, EDWARD J				
ART UNIT 3695		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 11/01/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket\_ip@pillsburylaw.com  
margaret.drosos@pillsburylaw.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/747,612

**Applicant(s)**

MCCOPPIN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Ed Baird

**Art Unit**

3695

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI.08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Interval Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

##### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on **09 August 2010** has been entered.

##### ***Status of Claims***

2. Applicant has amended claims **1-3, 7, 11, and 13-25**. Claim 6 has been canceled. Claim 26 had been added in Applicant's submission of 09 August 2010 and was subsequently canceled in the submission of 20 August 2010. Thus, claims 1-5 and 7-25 remain pending and are presented for examination.

##### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's remarks/ arguments and amendments filed **20 August 2010** (supplemental amendment) have been fully considered. Applicant's remarks/ arguments and amendments filed on 09 August 2010 have been entered but are mute in view of the supplemental amendment.

4. Examiner acknowledges amendments to **claims 1, 13 and 25** to overcome 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejections. However, amendments do not overcome rejections in as much as "ensuring against any deficiencies in the self-funding" is not enabled - 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, and is vague and indefinite - 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. See revised rejections below.

5. Applicant's arguments filed with respect to **claims 1-5 and 7-25** regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections. However, Examiner notes that no specific arguments have been

made showing why the prior art does not teach the claim limitations, nor how the amendments indicated any allowable features. Applicant merely states that the prior art does not teach the claimed limitations of the independent claims. Accordingly, arguments are not persuasive. Examiner will analyze the claims in light of the amended claim language.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1-5 and 7-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.
8. Regarding **claims 1, 13 and 25**, Applicant uses the term "said guaranteed transaction self-funding ensuring against any deficiencies in the self-funding". The specification does not indicate what the deficiencies in self-funding are, and how to ensure against any deficiencies in the self-funding.

Also, the exemplary limitation of claim 1:

- wherein *any deficiencies* in said self-funding- of the foreign financial transaction payment are prevented by domestic settlement funds transfer system insurance procedures of a central banking authority that controls the domestic settlement funds transfer system.

is not enabled as much as the specification does not describe all deficiencies as indicated by the term "any" deficiency.

9. **Claims 2-5, 7-12 and 14-24** are rejected by way of dependency on a rejected independent claim.

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claim 1-5 and 7-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

12. Regarding **claims 1, 13 and 25**, the phrases "guaranteed transaction self-funding" and "said guaranteed transaction self-funding ensuring against any deficiencies in the self-funding" is vague and indefinite. Examiner does not understand what the deficiencies in the self-funding are, or how to prevent them. Examiner interprets "said guaranteed transaction self-funding ensuring against any deficiencies in the self-funding" as merely a further definition of the word *guaranteed* and is not adding any substantial subject matter.

For purposes of examination, the phrase "provides guaranteed transaction self-funding of the foreign financial transaction payment to the Receiver Financial Institution, said guaranteed transaction self-funding ensuring against any deficiencies in the self-funding" will be interpreted as "provides a guarantee of the foreign financial transaction payment to the Receiver Financial Institution". Appropriate correction is required.

13. Regarding **claims 1, 13 and 25**, in the exemplary limitation of claim 1:

- wherein *any deficiencies* in said self-funding of the foreign financial transaction payment are prevented by domestic settlement funds transfer system insurance procedures of a central banking authority that controls the domestic settlement funds transfer system.

the term "any" deficiency is vague and indefinite. The term "any deficiency" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

For purposes of examination, the limitation will be interpreted as not further limiting.  
Appropriate correction is required.

14. **Claims 2-5, 7-12 and 14-24** are rejected by way of dependency on a rejected independent claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

15. *The rejections below are made in light of the 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejections above.*

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-15, and 17-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lawrence** (US Pub. No. 2003/0233319) in view of **Barbara et al** (US Pub. No. 2003/0105710).

18. Regarding **claims 1 and 13**, **Lawrence** teaches:

- receiving, in one or more computer processors at a Receiver Financial Institution, a single authorizing foreign financial transaction payment instruction from a Client Bank over a computer network [see at least 0065 and Figure 2]  
in a format associated with a domestic settlement funds transfer system used for funding domestic credit transfer transactions that provides guaranteed transaction

self-funding of the foreign financial transaction payment to the Receiver Financial Institution, said guaranteed transaction self-funding [sic] ensuring against any deficiencies in the self-funding - [see at least Abstract, 0022-0024, and Figure 1]. Examiner interprets financial institution as including Applicant's Client Bank and Receiver Financial Institution. Examiner notes that these financial institutions include "any insured bank"; thus "any insured bank" is indicative of Applicant's *guaranteeing transactions*;

- analyzing, by the one or more computer processors, the received single authorizing foreign financial transaction payment instruction [see at least 0030, 0032 and 0057]. Examiner interprets a *risk management clearing house (RMC)* which "gathers data . . . and relates the data to risk variables for the purpose of managing risk associated with a risk variable" as analogous to Applicant's *analyzing financial transaction payment instructions*, wherein said analyzing comprises identifying any necessary intermediary and processing financial institutions required to process the foreign financial transaction payment to the foreign financial transaction beneficiary [0032]; and
- responsive to said analyzing, generating, in the one or more computer processors, foreign financial transaction payment instructions for at least one financial institution located in the foreign country and transmitting the foreign financial transaction payment instructions over the computer network [see at least 0078 and Figure 5], the foreign financial transaction payment instructions including data in a funds transfer messaging service format that is compatible with both the Receiver Financial Institution and the at least one financial institution [see at least 0031 and 0033].

Examiner notes that *financial institutions* [0024] include foreign banks and foreign financial agencies as claimed by the Applicant.

**Lawrence** does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein said guaranteed, self-funding [sic] of the foreign financial transaction payment comprises both the Receiver Financial Institution and the Client Bank being members of the domestic settlement funds transfer system in which said members are required to: (1) have funds for the foreign financial transaction payment available in the domestic settlement funds transfer system, and (2) settle transactions daily initiated using the domestic settlement funds transfer system.

However, **Barbara** teaches a method and system for on-line payments which enables the making of payments using any of a credit card or a checking account or savings account to facilitate an on-line transaction [0006]. She further discloses *funds transfer capability* which allows a customer at a terminal to use the customer's transaction account to transfer funds, for example, between *eligible accounts* [0031]. In addition, the customer can use the transaction account to transfer funds, for example, via selection of a *self-fund mechanism* which will provided an instant *availability of funds* [id.]. This also enables the customer to move money from the customer's checking account in one bank to the customer's checking account *in a different bank* [0139]. In turn, the customer can use one account as collateral to ensure there are funds available in another account [id.]. Examiner notes that this *self-funding mechanism* is analogous to Applicant's *self-funding of the transaction* in that different accounts in different banks are used as back-up to ensure an available of funds.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to modify **Lawrence's** disclosure to include a *self-funding mechanism* as taught by **Barbara** because a user can use one account as collateral to ensure that there are



funds available in another account even when the accounts are in different banks [Barbara 0031 and 0139].

Examiner notes that the use of a *domestic settlement funds transfer system* and *settling transactions daily* are merely statements of intended use and are not given patentable weight. A recitation of intended use or purpose of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use or fulfilling said purpose, then it meets the claim. (See also MPEP § 2111.04).

19. Regarding **claims 2 and 14**, **Lawrence** teaches:

- wherein the settlement funds transfer system comprises a U.S. Federal Reserve Bank funds transfer system that carries out domestic funds transfers [see at least 0029],
- wherein the (single authorizing) foreign financial transaction payment instructions cause both an automatic credit and an automatic debit of associated accounts to be made upon receipt [see at least 0041 and 0042].

20. Regarding **claims 3 and 15**, **Lawrence** teaches:

- wherein the funds transfer messaging service format that is compatible with both the Receiver Financial Institution and the at least one financial institution is compatible with a world-wide financial messaging network interfaced with the computer network and comprising standardized messaging services and interface software running in the one or more computer processors that initiates international payments [see at least 0002, 0023, and 0029]. Examiner notes that SWIFT ("Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunication") is an example of Applicant's *world-wide financial messaging network*.

21. Regarding **claims 5 and 17, Lawrence** teaches the Client Bank as a domestic bank [0024].
22. Regarding **claims 7 and 19, Lawrence** teaches:
  - the foreign financial transaction payment instructions are received via a network interface with the domestic settlement funds transfer system, said network interface being configured to provide access to a U.S. Federal Reserve Bank funds transfer system useful for carrying out domestic funds transfers [see at least 0024].
23. Regarding **claims 8 and 20, Lawrence** teaches:
  - transmitting the foreign financial transaction payment instructions to the at least one financial institution [see at least 0024].
24. Regarding **claims 9 and 21, Lawrence** teaches:
  - the at least one financial institution includes a branch of the Receiver Financial Institution that generated and transmitted the foreign financial transaction payment instructions [see at least 0026 and 0027].
25. Regarding **claims 10 and 22, Lawrence** teaches:
  - the at least one financial institution includes a member of a non-Federal Reserve Bank electronic payments system [see at least 0024].
26. Regarding **claim 11, Lawrence** teaches:
  - the at least one financial institution includes a member of a U.S. Federal Reserve Bank funds transfer system that carries out domestic funds transfers [see at least 0023],
  - wherein the foreign financial transaction payment instructions cause both an automatic credit and an automatic debit of associated accounts to be made upon receipt thereof receipt [see at least 0041 and 0042].
27. Regarding **claims 12 and 24, Lawrence** teaches:

- the at least one financial institution includes a correspondent bank that is connected to the Receiver Financial Institution that generated and transmitted the foreign financial transaction payment instructions via a world-wide financial messaging network [see at least 0023 and 0029]
  - the world-wide financial messaging network comprises standardized messaging services and interface software (running in at least one processor that initiates - claim 24) used to initiate international payments [see at least 0067-0069],
  - the correspondent bank handling business in a particular geographic area [see at least 0002, 0051 and 0059].
28. Regarding **claims 18, Lawrence** teaches
- the single authorizing foreign payment instruction received from the client bank cause both an automatic credit and an automatic debit of associated accounts to be made upon receipt thereof [see at least 0041 and 0042].
29. Regarding **claim 23, Lawrence** teaches:
- the at least one financial institution includes a member of a U.S. Federal Reserve Bank funds transfer system **that carries** out domestic funds transfers [see at least 0023],
30. Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lawrence** in view of **Barbara** and in further view of **SWIFT.com** ("MT 103 migration – a success for the whole community", home page stories archive 2003, posted 11/21/2003).
31. Regarding **claims 4 and 16, Lawrence** and **Barbara** teaches all the items of claims 2 and 14, the claims upon which these claims depend, respectively, but do not teach foreign

financial transaction payment instructions which comply with SWIFT MT 103 specifications (i.e. messaging standards).

However, **SWIFT.com** teaches about foreign financial transaction payment instructions which comply with SWIFT MT 103 messaging standards. **SWIFT.com** discloses "The weekend of 15-16 November saw two significant events in SWIFT's history. The first was the removal of the MT 100, SWIFT's most-used message, from the network. To enable this to happen, migration to the MT 103 needed a successful completion and this was achieved with a 98% migration rate on the last working day before the deadline", [2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to modify **Lawrence's** disclosure to include *SWIFT MT 103 specifications* as disclosed by **SWIFT.com** because its use would increase certainty, transparency, and automation (STP) of customer transfers as well as reduced cost, reduced risk, and conform to worldwide regulatory requirements.

32. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lawrence** in view of **Barbara** in further view of **Official Notice**.

33. **Claim 25** is substantially similar to claims 1 and 13 with added limitations. **Lawrence** also teaches:

- ensuring compliance of the funds transfer instructions with one or more government requirements [see at least 0026 and 0050]. Examiner interprets *regulatory requirements* as analogous to Applicant's *government requirements*.
- if the funds transfer instructions are compliant with the one or more government requirements [0050], ensuring, via the computer system, that any required data fields in

the funds transfer instructions meet all data requirements of the settlement funds transfer system [see at least 0026 and 0030].

**Lawrence** does not explicitly disclose:

- if the funds transfer instructions meet said data requirements, crediting an account of the client bank established for foreign payments with an amount associated with the funds transfer instructions:

However, **Barbara** teaches crediting an account of the client bank to a foreign bank with the funds transfer instructions [see at least 0093 and 0139].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to modify **Lawrence's** disclosure to include *crediting an account of the client bank to a foreign bank* as taught by **Barbara** because a customer can use the system to make person-to-person payments to other recipients in different countries [**Barbara** 0093].

Neither **Lawrence** nor **Barbara** explicitly discloses:

- ending processing of the funds transfer *instructions* [sic] when funds transfer instructions are not compliant with government requirements, and
- ending processing of the funds transfer *instructions* [sic] and generating an error message if data requirements are not met.

However, Examiner takes **Official Notice** that one having ordinary skill in that art at the time of the instant invention would *end processing a funds transfer when funds transfer instructions are not compliant with government* because otherwise the transfer would be in violation of government requirements.

Examiner takes **Official Notice** that one having ordinary skill in that art at the time of the instant invention would *end processing a funds transfer and generate an error message when data requirements are not met* because the transfer process can not be performed properly.

**Conclusion**

34. The prior art of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure:

- **Kleckner et al:** "Method and apparatus for automating the process of settling financial transactions", (US Pub. No. 2002/0174066).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ed Baird whose telephone number is (571)270-3330. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:30 am - 5:00 pm Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles R. Kyle can be reached on 571-272-6746. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ed Baird/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3695

/Narayanswamy Subramanian/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3695